

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                                       | FILING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|---|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/642,945  | 08/18/2003     | Kevin L. Krysiak     | WTO148                  | 4281             |  |
| 75  | 590 06/30/2006 |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |  |
| Terence P. O'Brien                                    |                |                      | NGUYEN, KIEN T          |                  |  |
| Wilson Sporting Goods Co.<br>8700 W. Bryn Mawr Avenue |                |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
| Chicago, IL 6   |                |                      | 3711                    |                  |  |
|   |                |                      | DATE MAILED: 06/30/2006 |                  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   |   | Application No.   | Applicant(s)   |             |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|-------------|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary                                 |   | 10/642,945  | KRYSIAK ET AL.   |             |  |  |  |
|   |   | Examiner  | Art Unit   | <del></del> |  |  |  |
|   |   | Kien T. Nguyen  | 3711   |             |  |  |  |
| Period fo   | <ul> <li>The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br/>or Reply</li> </ul>   | pears on the cover sheet with the o   | correspondence address   |             |  |  |  |
| WHIC<br>- Exter<br>after<br>- If NC<br>- Failu<br>Any | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from . cause the application to become ABANDONE | N. nety filed the mailing date of this communi D (35 U.S.C. 8 133) | ·           |  |  |  |
| Status  |   |   |  |             |  |  |  |
| 1)  | Responsive to communication(s) filed on   |   |  |             |  |  |  |
|   | This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.   |   |  |             |  |  |  |
| 3)  | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is   |   |  |             |  |  |  |
|   | closed in accordance with the practice under E  | x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4   | 53 O.G. 213.   |             |  |  |  |
| Dispositi   | on of Claims  |   |  |             |  |  |  |
| 5)□<br>6)⊠<br>7)□                                     | Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or   | vn from consideration.  |  |             |  |  |  |
|   | on Papers   | ·   |  |             |  |  |  |
|   | The specification is objected to by the Examiner  |   |  |             |  |  |  |
|   | The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce   |   | =xaminer   |             |  |  |  |
| ,   | Applicant may not request that any objection to the o   |   |  |             |  |  |  |
|   | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti   | - · ·   | ` '  | 21(d).      |  |  |  |
|   | The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa   |   |  |             |  |  |  |
| Priority u  | ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119   |   |  |             |  |  |  |
| a)[   | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the prioric application from the International Bureau see the attached detailed Office action for a list of  | s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  | on No ed in this National Stage                                    | <b>;</b>    |  |  |  |
| Attachment  | • •   |   |  |             |  |  |  |
| 1) 🔼 Notice<br>2) 🗌 Notice                            | e of References Cited (PTO-892)<br>e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da  |  |             |  |  |  |
| 3) 🔲 Inforn   | nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date  |   | atent Application (PTO-152)  |             |  |  |  |

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 25, 26, 31, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brantley U.S. Patent 5,580,049.

Brantley disclosed a game ball comprising a spherical carcass (12), a one-piece cover (26) surrounding the carcass and bonded to the carcass, the cover having a thickness 0.05-0.3 mm which is less then 0.5 mm; the cover (26) is formed of a polyurethane (column 3, lines 2-9); the carcass includes a bladder (12) and at least one backing layer (18) made of woven fabric of multi-ply yarns embedded with a PVC for stability positioned over the bladder (12).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 5-13, 16-24, 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brantley.

Regarding claims 1, and 11, it is noted that Brantley utilized a backing layer and the claimed invention directed to a cover being free of a backing layer. However, it

Art Unit: 3711

appears that by eliminating the backing layer would reduce the overall weight of the ball. Accordingly, it would have been a matter of design choice to eliminate the backing layer of Brantley for the purpose of reducing its weight to accommodate any specific type of play environment.

Regarding claims 5-8, 16-19, and 27-30, it is noted that Brantley failed to specifically disclose the specific density of the cover material as set forth therein.

However, the density of the cover material varies with the specific play environment as long as it does not compromise the playability of the ball. Furthermore, the specification of the present application does not specifically point out the significant advantage of different densities. Accordingly, it would have been a matter of design choice to provide the cover of Brantley with any of the recited densities as along as it does not compromise the playability of the ball.

Regarding the specific method of applying polyurethane as recited in claims 2, 11, and 25, such methods are very well known in the art and commonly used in the sport balls industry. Accordingly, applying the polyurethane cover to the ball of Brantley with any of the well-known method merely a common practice.

Claims 3, 4, 14, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brantley as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Way U.S. Patent 2,945,693.

It is noted that the ball of Brantley failed to show a layer of thread wound around the bladder as claimed. However, such layer of thread is extremely well known in the art as evidenced by Way for the purpose of increasing the durability of the ball. Art Unit: 3711

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art provide the bladder of Brantley with a layer of thread for the reason as set forth above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kien T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4428. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eugene Kim can be reached on (571) 272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kien T. Nguyen Primary Examiner Art Unit 3711

Ktn